

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 13-261

---

Judge:	No. 1030714780A
Complainant:	No. 1030714780B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge violated numerous rules of criminal procedure in his case and improperly threatened the jury so as to cause it to quickly render a verdict.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judge engaged in conduct that violated the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution or the Code of Judicial Conduct and, if so, to take appropriate disciplinary action. The purpose and authority of the commission is limited to this mission.

After review of the complaint, the commission determined that it was stale as the alleged misconduct occurred in 2008. Beyond that determination, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of court rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: November 14, 2013.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer  

---

George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on November 14, 2013.

*This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.*

2013-261

10-6-13

OCT 08 2013

TO STATE OF ARIZONA  
COMM. ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT  
1501 W. WASHINGTON ST, STE 229  
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007

FM.

RE. CONDUCT OF

DEAR COMMISSIONERS;

I AM MAKING A FORMAL COMPLAINT TO YOUR  
COMMISSION AGAINST THAT  
OCCURRED DURING MY CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS IN

IN FOLLOWING YOUR FORMAT;

- 1.
- 2.
3. I HAVE NO CONTACTABLE TELEPHONE NUMBERS.
4. HONORABLE
5. -
6. YES, I DID HAVE A CASE, NO, IT IS NOT STILL PENDING.  
(A)

2013-261

(B) ATTORNEYS WHO APPEARED;

(C) LIST OF WITNESSES TO ALLEGATIONS ARE ABOVE INCLUDING:

1. ON COMPLAINANT'S PUBLIC DEFENDER FILED A MOTION TO DESIGNATE HIS CASE COMPLEX, THIS WAS IN OUTSIDE THE GUIDELINES OF ARIZ. R. CRIM. PROC. RULE 8.1(E) OF FILING WITHIN 25 DAYS OF ARRAIGNMENT. YET ALLOWED THIS MOTION AND FURTHER ERRED ON WHEN IT ORDERED DESIGNATION TO COMPLEX BEFORE ON COURT'S OWN MOTION OUTSIDE THE 5 DAY GUIDELINE IN ARIZ. R. CRIM. PROC. RULE 8.1(E).

2. ON GRANTED A MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE FOR (EXCLUDED) OUTSIDE OF GUIDELINES OF ARIZ. R. CRIM. PROC. RULE 8.5(B) OF MAXIMUM OF 30 DAYS

3. ON GRANTED A MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE FOR (EXCLUDED) OUTSIDE THE GUIDELINES OF ARIZ. R. CRIM. PROC. RULE 8.5(B)

2013-261

OF THE MAXIMUM OF 30 DAYS.

4. ON \_\_\_\_\_ WITH CONFERENCE  
OF \_\_\_\_\_ OF  
COMPLEX CASE OUTSIDE GUIDELINES OF ARIZ. P.  
CRIM. PROC. RULE 8.1(E).

5. ON \_\_\_\_\_ GAVE JURY,  
WHICH WAS IMPASSE, ULTIMATUM TO BRING  
A VERDICT

AT 1:39 P.M. \_\_\_\_\_ COURT WAS RECONVENED  
FROM \_\_\_\_\_ ULTIMATUM  
VIOLATED 6TH, 5TH, AND  
14TH AMENDMENT TO DUE PROCESS AND SAME  
RIGHTS UNDER ARIZ. CONSTITUTION.

6. DURING TRIAL, \_\_\_\_\_ REPEATEDLY SAID  
THAT TRIAL WAS WITHIN A TIME LIMIT, THIS  
INCLUDING REFUSING TO  
FOR \_\_\_\_\_ OF STATE'S EXHIBITS.

FOR THESE REASONS, COMPLAINANT ASKS  
THIS COMMISSION TO SANCTION  
AS WITHIN YOUR JURISDICTION. THIS  
COMPLAINANT FEELS HE IS A  
DUE TO THE LACK OF \_\_\_\_\_ DILIGENCE  
TO ABIDE BY ARIZONA'S RULES OF CRIMINAL  
PROCEDURE AND ARIZONA'S RULES OF

EVIDENCE.

7. I UNDERSTAND THIS COMMISSION DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO REVERSE A COURT ORDER OR ASSIGN A JUDGE.

8. I AFFIRM, UNDER THAT THE FOREGOING INFORMATION AND ALLEGATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS COMPLAINT ARE TRUE